

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 9 and 16 were previously cancelled. Thus, claims 1-8 and 10-15 remain pending in the present application, and. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking a sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the registered image" in the claims. (See 01/10/2008 Office Action p. 2).

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite "the viewing system further comprising an image processing means arranged to eliminate high lights in a registered image." Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 10 are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,006,129 to McClure (hereinafter "McClure") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0003571 to Schofield et al. (hereinafter "Schofield") in further view of US. Patent Publication 2003/0016881 to Matsuura (hereinafter "Matsuura"). (See 01/10/2008 Office Action p. 2).

McClure teaches a rear-view display system for a vehicle comprising a camera that is disposed near the rear of the vehicle and being generally rearwardly directed. (See McClure Abstract). McClure further teaches a display that is in the general form and location of a conventional center-mounted rear-view mirror. (See McClure Abstract).

NL 020680

Schofield teaches a vehicular video mirror system which includes an interior rear-view mirror assembly and a video display assembly. (See Schofield Abstract).

Matsuura teaches an image processing apparatus and method which can perform proper white balance adjustment for images. (See Matsuura ¶ 11). Matsuura further teaches an image processing apparatus comprising an image processing apparatus comprising extraction means for extracting a highlight area on the basis of a color distribution of an input image; calculation means for calculating white balance of the input image on the basis of pixels having luminances less than a predetermined highlight point in the highlight area; and setting means for setting a gradation correction condition on the basis of white balance and the highlight point. (See Matsuura ¶ 12). Matsuura specifically teaches white balance adjustment according to such image features. (See Matsuura ¶ 13).

Claim 10 recites “the viewing system further comprising an image processing means arranged to eliminate high lights in a registered image.” The Examiner has stated that McClure teaches the above recitation, “but does not go into specifics as to whether this correction was done with lens adjustment or digital enhancement means.” (See 1/10/2008 Office Action, p. 4). Applicants respectfully submit that the fact that McClure does not go into specifics means that McClure does not teach the recitation. Furthermore, applicants respectfully submit that McClure does not even suggest that digital enhancement means could be used to modify a registered image. McClure’s discussion of known technologies for adjusting to lighting conditions, only the camera and/or lens features were described. (See McClure, col. 7, lines 32-44). Any known technologies of camera and/or lens features in adjusting to lighting conditions would be adjustments to the image **prior** to the image being registered and **not** “in the registered image,” as recited in claim 10. For example, if there is little light, the iris on the camera will open up to let in the maximum amount of light. Further, if there is too much light, the iris may need to be closed to reduce the amount of light. The iris lighting condition adjustments are done **before** registering an image. In McClure’s viewing system, the camera cannot “eliminate high lights *in the registered image*,” as recited in claim 10. The only disclosure in McClure about a registered image is that the display driver 132 will “perform a “left/right reversal of the image that is to be

NL 020680

presented on the display 130." (See McClure, col. 5, lines 31-34). That is, McClure does not include any process means relating to light with the registered image.

The Examiner seems to implicitly acknowledge this by going on to state that "as is evidence by the teachings of Matsura the correction of shadow or highlight regions by digital means was well known in the art at the time of the invention." (See 1/10/2008 Office Action, p. 4). However, the Examiner's reliance on Matsura is misplaced. Matsuura merely teaches white balance adjustment according to image features. (See Matsuura ¶ 13). Matsuura does teach calculating the highlight/shadow in the image. (See Matsuura ¶ 62-66). However, Matsuura merely uses this calculation of the highlight/shadow to adjust the white balance of the image without giving any consideration to corrections to a highlighted area. (See Matsuura ¶ 71-76). Thus, Matsuura does not teach "the viewing system further comprising an image processing means arranged to **eliminate** high lights in the registered image."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Schofield does not cure the above-described deficiency of McClure with respect to claim 10. Specifically, Schofield discloses a filter 8640 that is aligned over opening 8614a to adjust for bright light or low light conditions. (See Schofield, ¶ [0478]). Like McClure, Schofield's filter adjusts for lighting conditions **before** registering an image.

Accordingly, McClure, Schofield and Matsuura, either alone or in combination, do not teach nor suggest "a viewing system further comprising an image processing means arranged to eliminate high lights in a registered image," as recited in claim 10, and therefore this rejection should be overturned. Because claims 11-15 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClure in view of Schofield in further view of Matsuura in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0214584 to Ross (hereinafter "Ross"). (See 1/10/2008 Office Action p. 6).

NL 020680

For the same reasons described above with reference to claim 10, applicants respectfully submit that McClure, Schofield and Matsuura do not teach or suggest "the viewing system further comprising an image processing means arranged to eliminate high lights in a registered image," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Ross does not cure the above-described deficiency with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Ross is completely silent with respect to any type of light adjustments.

Accordingly, McClure, Schofield, Matsuura and Ross, either alone or in any combination, do not teach nor suggest "a viewing system further comprising an image processing means arranged to eliminate high lights in a registered image," as recited in claim 1, and therefore this rejection should be overturned. Because claims 2-8 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

NL 020680

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 11, 2008

By: 
Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276